



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,927	11/30/2001	Syed M. Ali	16159/021001; P6416	5348
32615	7590	08/12/2005	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			DOAN, DUYEN MY	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2143		

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/997,927	ALI ET AL.
	Examiner Duyen M. Doan	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1, 9, 25-30 and 33-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-8, 10-24, 31 and 32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

Detail Action

Claims 1, 9, 25-30, 33-36 are cancelled.

Claims 8 and 24 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 2-8, 10-24, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Glass (us pat 6629128).

As regarding claim 2, Glass discloses interposing a server runtime between the client runtime and the server portion that enables interaction between the client runtime and the server portion (col.11, line 3-38).

As regarding claim 3, Glass discloses sending a message to the server runtime to fetch data from the remote object (col.13, line 54-67, col.14, line 1-17).

As regarding claim 4, Glass discloses receiving data fetched by the server runtime and caching data in the proxy (col.13, line 54-67, col.14, line 1-17).

As regarding claim 5, Glass discloses sending a message to the server runtime to synchronize data cached in the proxy with data in the remote object (col.14, line 41-67).

As regarding claim 6, Glass discloses sending a message to the server runtime to invoke a method of the remote object on behalf of the proxy (col.13, line 54-67, col.14, line 1-17).

As regarding claim 7, Glass discloses receiving a result of invoking the method of the remote object from the server runtime and passing the result to the proxy (col.13, line 54-67, col.14, line 1-17).

As regarding claim 8, Glass disclosed creating a proxy for each of a plurality of remote objects in the server portion, each proxy implementing an interface of a corresponding remote object and having a capability to cached data from the remote object (col.7, lines 65-67, col.8, lines 1-23); modifying the client portion to substitute a call for the remote object with a call for the proxy (col.7, lines 40-47); and interposing a client runtime that includes the proxy for each of remote objects between the client portion and the server portion (col.7, lines 40-67, col.8, lines 1-23) wherein creating the proxy for each of the plurality of remote objects in the server portion comprises analyzing the server portion to determine each of the plurality the remote objects in the server portion between the client portion and the server portion (col.7, line 56-67, col.8, line 1-7).

As regarding claim 9, Glass discloses creating the proxy for the plurality of remote objects in the server portion comprises analyzing the server portion to determine the remote objects in the server portion (col.11, line 1-38).

As regarding claim 10, Glass discloses analyzing the server portion comprises parsing machine code for the server portion (col.9, line 45-55).

As regarding claim 11, Glass discloses analyzing the server portion comprises parsing a descriptor containing a list of classes in the server portion (col.9, line 1-67).

As regarding claim 12, Glass discloses analyzing the server portion comprises parsing source code for the server portion (col.9, line 56-67, col.10, line 1-29).

As regarding claim 13, Glass discloses modifying the client portion comprises modifying machine code for the client portion (col.7, line 1-37, col.6, line 1-34).

As regarding claim 14, Glass discloses modifying the client portion comprises modifying source code for the client portion (col.7, line 1-37, col.6, line 1-34).

As regarding claim 15, Glass discloses modifying the client portion to substitute a call to a first lookup service that locates the remote object with a call to a second lookup service that locates the corresponding proxy (col.7, line 1-37, col.6, line 1-34).

As regarding claim 16, Glass discloses the lookup service that locates the corresponding proxy is included in the runtime (col.7, line 1-37, col.6, line 1-34).

As regarding claim 17, Glass discloses modifying the client portion to substitute a call to manage a lifecycle of the remote object with a call to manage a lifecycle of the corresponding proxy (col.7, line 34-47).

As regarding claim 18, Glass discloses fetching data from the remote object into the proxy associated with the remote object (col.9, line 19-38).

As regarding claim 19, Glass discloses synchronizing data in the proxy with data in the remote object associated with the proxy (col.9, line 19-38).

As regarding claim 20, Glass discloses invoking a method of the remote object on behalf of the proxy associated with the remote object (col.7, line 34-47).

As regarding claim 21, Glass discloses receiving a result of invoking the method of the remote object and passing the result to the proxy (col.14, line 1-17).

As regarding claim 22, Glass discloses the runtime includes a client runtime that interacts with the client portion and a server runtime that interacts with the server portion (col.11, line 54-67, col.12, line 1-20).

As regarding claim 23, Glass discloses the client runtime and server runtime communicate in order to enable interaction between the client portion and the server portion (col.11, line 54-67, col.12, line 1-20).

As regarding claim 24, Glass discloses analyzing the server portion to find each remote object in the server portion (col.11, line 1-38); creating the proxy for each remote object in the server portion and including the proxy in a client runtime library (col.6, line 14-34, col.4, line 1-52); analyzing the client portion to determine calls made to remote objects in the server portion and replacing calls for remote objects with calls for a corresponding proxy (col.7, line 1-37, col.6, line 1-34); and interposing the client runtime library between the client portion and the server portion (col.7, line 56-67, col.8, line 1-7).

As regarding claim 31, Glass discloses A computer-readable medium having recorded thereon instructions executable by a processor, the instructions for: analyzing a server portion of a distributed application to find each remote object in the server portion (col.11, line 1-38); generating a proxy for each remote object in the server portion (col.6, line 14-34, col.4, line 1-52); and including the proxy for each remote object in the server portion in a runtime library (col.7, line 56-67, col.8, line 1-7).

As regarding claim 32, Glass discloses instructions for modifying a client portion of the distributed application such that a call for a remote object is replaced with a call for a corresponding proxy (col.7, line 34-47).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's first argument regarding amended claim 24 "There is no teaching or suggestion in Glass of analyzing the server portion to find all of the remote objects for the purpose of creating a proxy for all the remote objects". Applicant pointed out the limitation that is not in the claim. Amended claim 24 recited that "create a proxy for each remote object in the server portion", **not** create a proxy for all remote objects in the server.

In response to Applicant's second argument, "analyzing the client portion to determine calls made to remote objects in the server portion and replacing calls for remote objects with calls for a corresponding proxy". Glass disclosed remote proxy acts as a middleman between the requested object and the requesting object to provide additional processing functionality (see Glass col.7, lines 44-47). Instead of making a call to the server's object, client can make a call to the remote proxy.

In response to Applicant's third argument regarding amended claims 8, 31 "Glass fail to teach analyzing the server portion to find each remote object in the server portion and creating the proxy for each remote object in the server portion". Glass disclosed "proxies should be generated for each of the subject object's super classes" In order to create proxies for each of the subject object's super classes, the server have to be analyzed (examining or looking at the server's object) before creating the proxy for that class object in the server.

In response to Applicant's fourth argument regarding claim 10, 12 "Glass fail to teach analyzing machine code or source code to locate remote objects". Glass disclosed creating the byte code, creating the source code, or parsing the source code for the purpose creating the proxy object. By parsing the source code, it actually analyzing it.

In response to Applicant's fifth argument regarding claim 15, "Glass fail to teach multiple look up services" these look up services that Applicant claim use to locate object in the server or proxy object. If the proxy act as a middle man between the requesting object and the requested object (Glass col.7, lines 40-47), the allocation of

the remote proxy or the server's object have to be done before the client can actually accessing the object. Therefore Glass taught the look up services.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143

DD



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100